

GGSG PROCUREMENT – DRAFT RFP QUESTIONS/RESPONSES – SET ONE

1. **QUESTION:** L.17(a) indicates that offerors should provide information on “all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2,500,000...” Given the maximum order value of \$45M projected for this contract, the threshold of \$2.5M seems low for determining size-relevant contracts and may lead to unnecessarily long lists of contracts that meet the criteria. We recommend that GSFC consider changing the threshold to \$15M, which would be more representative of a somewhat similar sized contract.

RESPONSE: The Government has established a minimum annual relevancy threshold for submitting past performance information. The threshold is a minimum annual threshold which the Government believes is commensurate with the GGSG requirement and maximizes competition. The threshold minimum for prime offerors will remain unchanged.

The Government has decided to revise the following paragraph in L.17 (a) Past Performance:

L.17 (a) Past Performance will be revised in the final RFP as follows:

“A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of **\$1,500,000**. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.* The offeror shall provide the information requested below for any significant subcontractor(s) for those similar efforts within the last 3 years of the RFP release date with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of the estimated dollar value of the proposed significant subcontract.”

2. **QUESTION:** M.6 indicates that prime contractor’s reference(s) correspond to contracts of at least \$2.5M. Given the maximum order value of \$45M projected for this contract, the threshold of \$2.5M seems low for determining size-relevant contracts and may lead to unnecessarily long lists of contracts that meet the criteria. We recommend that GSFC consider changing the threshold to \$15M, which would be more representative of a somewhat similar sized contract.

RESPONSE: The Government has established a minimum annual relevancy threshold for submitting past performance information. The threshold is a minimum

annual threshold which the Government believes is commensurate with the GGSG requirement and maximizes competition. The threshold minimum for prime offerors will remain unchanged.

The Government has decided to revise the following paragraph in M.6 Past Performance:

M.6 Past Performance will be revised in the final RFP as follows:

“A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1,500,000. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.* For a significant subcontractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally —relevant, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform. “

3. **QUESTION:** REFERENCE: SECTION L.17 Past Performance Volume, (a) Information from the Offeror: In reference to the Past Performance volume, Information from the Offeror section it is stated that “Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2,500,000 that your company has had within the last 3 years of the RFP release date. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size, content, and/or complexity) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract”.

We understand that the intent of the statement above is to limit offerors to submitting past performance citations on the same size scale as the current opportunity. Small businesses competing on this type of work tend to have multiple smaller contracts that collectively provide their science qualifications.

We request an exemption for small business companies of 1000 employees or fewer in the form of a reduced minimum average annual cost/fee incurred amount for past performance contract citations – or a mix of one or two larger contracts with the remainder being smaller. The inclusion of a small number of larger contracts would demonstrate the company’s ability to manage a larger effort but to provide its science qualifications from the smaller contracts.

Specifically, for this solicitation we request that small business past performance be given a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$1,000,000 (i.e. 5% of a total 5-year contract value of ~\$100M). We believe that this value is a substantial enough size for relevant science work to judge past performance.

RESPONSE: Same as Response 1.

4. **QUESTION:** Draft RFP Section L14 (c) (8) - Is having a Joint-Venture (J-V) agreement a mandatory or a desired requirement on small businesses participating in this procurement? What factors will affect the evaluation of an offeror not having a J-V agreement in place with its proposal? Would this be an evaluation factor in Section M?

RESPONSE: Small businesses may choose to submit proposals as Joint Ventures or as stand-alone entities. Any potential offeror who intends to respond to this requirement as a Joint Venture must provide a copy of a SBA approved joint venture agreement compliant with 13 CFR 124.513. If an offeror submits a proposal as a joint venture and does not submit the required SBA approved joint venture agreement then the offeror is not in compliance with the RFP and may be viewed as nonresponsive.

5. **QUESTION:** Draft RFP L.15.3 (page 24) - Subfactor D - Small Business Subcontracting - Besides stating of their goals, what tangible evidence from large businesses will be required to assess their serious intentions for meeting the subcontracting goals right from the start / award of the contract? (The RFP notes that the meeting of the Subcontracting Goals will be evaluated at the conclusion of the contract. (RFP page 25, paragraph # (3))

RESPONSE: The government will evaluate the offeror's commitment to subcontracting in accordance with the criteria listed in Section M.4, Subfactor D, Small Business Utilization. The offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements.

6. **QUESTION:** Draft page 25, last paragraph # (6) - "Offerors are advised that a proposal will not be rejected solely because the submitted plan does not meet the NASA recommended goals that are expressed in paragraph a)(2)...." This evaluation sounds very easy on large businesses. This implies that large businesses don't have to support their small business subcontracting goals with any tangible evidence; they don't even have to meet the NASA recommended goals!

RESPONSE: The Government's intent is to encourage offerors to propose goals that are equivalent to or greater than those recommended and outlined within the RFP. Generally, the extent of commitment is a reflection of the offeror's independent assessment of the small business subcontracting opportunities available. In accordance with Section L.15, 3, Subfactor D, (a) (6) "Offerors shall discuss the rationale for any goal proposed that is less than the Contracting Officer's recommended goal in any category. In addition, the Offeror shall describe the efforts made to establish a goal for that category and what ongoing efforts, if any, the Offeror plans during performance to increase participation in that category.

7. **QUESTION:** Draft Section L.17 (a), page 38, 2nd. & 3rd. paragraphs - The way these paragraphs read, they seem to fit better under the small business subcontracting related sections.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment, however, the language shall remain unchanged. That section pertains to Past Performance and provides instructions on the determination that a subcontractor is significant. It also provides the Government insight on which areas of work the subcontractor is proposed to perform and how the past performance references submitted correlate to the work.

8. **QUESTION:** Draft SOW - A 60 page SOW is definitely overwhelming. Does all the work noted in this SOW represent major activities only?

RESPONSE: No. The SOW represents the body of work that may be captured on the resultant contract, not just the major ones. Specific work required will be executed via task order.

9. **QUESTION:** What has been the historical data in terms of man-hours or actual costs for performing these activities during the past couple of years? Section 1 - Geodynamic, Geomagnetic and Planetary Studies, Section 2 - Altimetry and Remote Sensing, Section 3 - Software Development and Maintenance, Section 4 - Data Centers. Having such historical data available at the next level will provide a much better insight on the workload and complexity of the SOW activities.

RESPONSE: The government will provide the approximate FTE for the current contract which is approximately 57 for the periods of 2008 and 2009. The Library copies of 533's (redacted) are available to view at :
<http://science.gsfc.nasa.gov/690/GGSG/index.html>

10. **QUESTION:** When will the interested companies list be posted on FBO?

RESPONSE: An interested parties listing has been posted and will be updated periodically. If an offeror is interested in adding their company to this list, please email: Jennifer.A.Oconnell@nasa.gov

11. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.9; L.15.3; L.16.2(p) Please clarify which subcontractors must provide a Total Compensation Plan (TCP). The instructions in sections L.9 have conditions which must be met for a subcontractor to have to submit a TCP, however, section L.15.3 states that ALL service subcontractors must submit Exhibits C14A and C14B to provide a detailed itemization of the employee and employer contributions of the fringe benefits proposed. Is it the Government's intention that ALL

subcontractors develop and submit exhibits C14A and C14B even if they do not reach the threshold for full TCP submission as defined in section L.9?

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment and will revise Section L.16.2(p) in the Final RFP to clarify that the prime and significant subcontractors must complete the cost charts (exhibits c-14a and c-14b). Non-significant subcontractors do not need to complete exhibits c-14a and c-14b. The total compensation plan must be submitted by offeror and all services subcontractors in accordance with the NFS 1852.231-71 threshold (which may or may not be a significant subcontractor).

12. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.9; L.16.1 We suggest that the requirements for submitting a TCP be aligned with those for submitting a Cost Volume, i.e., clearly requiring that all subcontractors who are submitting a Cost Volume are required to also submit a TCP as part of their Cost Volume. Additionally, we recommend that the government change the condition that defines a subcontractor as ‘significant’ from a pricing perspective. Rather than specify the condition of “exceeds 20% of the proposed Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate”, we suggest that the condition be stated as a percentage (in terms of dollar value) of annual, or total, contract performance. This request is made since RTO responses will be under development throughout the proposal preparation period. The uncertainty in its final cost estimate may create significant difficulty in establishing which subcontractors are required to develop full cost proposals and in allowing subcontractors time to prepare detailed cost proposals. A fixed criterion, known in advance, will eliminate this difficulty.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request, however, the language shall remain unchanged. The requirements set forth by clause 1852.231-71 are not to be changed by the Contract Officer without a deviation approved by the Associate Administrator for Procurement at NASA HQ. The Government does not believe a deviation is warranted to the clause. Defining Significant subcontractors by the amount proposed for each RTO can be more easily validated/calculated by the Government during proposal evaluation. Therefore, the Government has determined that a change will not be made to define significant subcontractors by the percentage of annual/total contract performance.

13. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.13(a)5 This DRFP paragraph states a requirement that “The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the technical requirements of only the selected functions of the SOW and the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied (i.e., SOW element versus offeror’s proposal page numbers).” Is this SOW Compliance Matrix required only to be included in the Mission Suitability Volume? Do offerors need to also include one in the Past Performance Volume?

RESPONSE: Offerors shall include the SOW compliance Matrix in the Mission Suitability Volume only.

14. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.13(a)5 Please clarify the requirement for the SOW Compliance Matrix. In stating that the matrix should show where in the proposal the technical requirements “of only the selected functions of the SOW” are satisfied, are you referring to those SOW elements specified as “Key Requirements” under Subfactor A – Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work”?

RESPONSE: Yes.

15. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.13(b)1 The table in this DRFP paragraph appears to contain incorrect references to subsequent Section L paragraphs. For instance, the table indicates that the Reference for the Offer Volume is L.15, when it is labeled as L.14 in the following text. Similarly, Mission Suitability Volume’s reference should be L.15 (instead of L.16), the Cost Volume’s should be L.16 (instead of L.17), and the Past Performance Volume’s should be L.17 (instead of L.18).

RESPONSE: The government will revise this table to reflect the correct Sections for the final RFP.

16. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.13(b)1 The chart indicates that the page limit for the BOEs is 50 pages “Inclusive of Prime and each Significant Subcontractor.” Is it the government’s expectation that the Prime and Significant Subcontractors will each

have BOEs in their cost proposals and that these will add to a cumulative total of 50 pages, or may the Prime's BOEs be the total team BOEs so long as they are inclusive of all Prime and Significant Subcontractor effort?

RESPONSE: The total page limit is 50 pages inclusive of Prime and significant subcontractors. The government will not evaluate any pages over the limit. It is the offerors determination as to where the BOE's are located.

17. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.13(b)2 This paragraph specifies that bidders must use a 12 point Times New Roman font with a 10 point font size acceptable for text in diagrams, charts, and tables, artwork, and photographs. While we understand the need for a 12 point font to enhance readability of the proposal narrative, restricting bidders to the use of a single type of font (Times New Roman) reduces our ability to mix fonts to further enhance readability of proposal content. The DRFP pricing exhibits were published using ARIAL font, possibly for its greater readability. We strongly recommend removing the restriction to use only the Times New Roman type font and only keep the restriction to use a 12-point font.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request, however, the language shall remain unchanged. This is a Goddard-wide standard format and all offerors are expected to comply.

18. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.13(b); L.15.3 Subfactor C The requirement for the "Mentor-Protégé Program" description appears in a sequence of requirements for various plans that are specifically excluded from the 80-page limit for the Mission Suitability Volume. Is it intended that this description also be excluded from the page limit?

RESPONSE: No, the Mentor-Protégé Program response is not excluded from the page limit.

19. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.13(b); L.15.3 Subfactor D Please provide clarification regarding the page limit for the Mission Suitability Volume. Section L.13 specifies a

page limit for the volume as 80 pages. While several plans required for Subfactor C - Management Approach are excluded from the page limit, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan required under Subfactor D - Small Business Utilization is not excluded. Like the other management plans, Small Business Subcontracting Plans can typically be 20 to 25 pages in length so that each requirement of FAR clause 52.219-9 is clearly addressed. Additionally, should a small business submit a proposal as a prime bidder, they will have an unfair advantage with respect to the page limit. Will the government please consider excluding the Small Business Subcontracting Plan from the 80- page limitation?

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request and will revise the table on L.13(b)(1) (a) for the Final RFP to exclude the Small Business Utilization (Subcontracting Plan) from the page limitations specified.

20. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.15.3 Subfactor B In order to establish the scope for RTO 1, it is necessary to know (a) that exact satellite complement which is to be addressed. The task mentions GEOSAT, GFO, T/P, Jason-1, Jason-2, ICESAT, DESDYN1, GFO-2, and Jason-3. Is this the complete set? (b) Improving the orbit accuracy for these missions is an iterative process as models are improved and tested. To ensure that all proposals address the same level of effort, would the government provide an estimate of their expectation on how many iterations would take place per year? For example, is it expected that a new set of orbits would be provided for each satellite once per year? Also, are we to assume that GEODYN and SOLVE support for this task are not to be priced and are covered within the scope of a different SOW element?

RESPONSE: RTO's have been revised and posted for comment by 9/24/10.

21. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.15.3 Subfactor B; L.16.2.d This DRFP paragraph on Page 20 instructs the offeror to "complete Exhibit C-3 chart/table of proposed staffing for the RTOs, per labor category, which matches the proposed qualifications requirements, and identifies who is available from the prime contractor or any team

member(s).” The instructions for the Cost Volume, also instruct that we provide Exhibit C-3 in Volume II. Are these duplicate requirements? If it is a duplicate requirement, can an offeror place Exhibit C-3 in the Cost Volume and reference their location in the Mission Suitability Volume instead of duplicating the information? If you do require that this full-page exhibit be presented in both volumes, will it be excluded from the 80-page limit for the Mission Suitability Volume?

RESPONSE: Yes, they are duplicative requirements. Exhibit C-3 should be placed in the cost volume and a reference of the location in the mission suitability volume is acceptable.

22. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.15.3 Subfactor C The requirement for a Total Compensation Plan (TCP), in paragraph 3, requires that the “offeror and all services subcontractors (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71)” provide a detailed list of their fringe benefits and company estimated cost per hour. NFS 1852.231-71 paragraph (d) cites “The offeror shall require all service subcontractors (1) with proposed cost reimbursement or non-competitive fixed price type subcontracts having a total potential value in excess of \$500,000 and (2) the cumulative value of all their service subcontracts under the proposed prime contract in excess of 10 percent of the prime contractor’s total potential value, provide as part of their proposals the information identified in (a) through (c) of this provision. This appears to be a different threshold for subcontractors than that defined in the DRFP in L.16.1 as ‘significant subcontractor’. Is this requirement to be limited to only those subcontractors who are defined as “Significant Subcontractors” relative to pricing RTOs, as defined in L.16.1, since C-14A and C-14B (the referenced charts) are pricing exhibits? Or, should we apply the condition specified in NFS 1852.231-71 to determine which subcontractors are required to submit a TCP?

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment and will revise Section L.16.2(p) in the Final RFP to clarify that the prime and significant subcontractors must complete the cost charts (exhibits c-14a and c-14b). Non-significant subcontractors do not need to complete exhibits C-14a and c-14b. The total compensation plan must be submitted by the offeror and all services

subcontractors in accordance with the NFS 18.52.231-71 threshold (which may or may not be a significant subcontractor).

23. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.15.3 Subfactor C; L.16.2.a The final sentence in this subparagraph gives instructions that in Section 5 of the Cost Volume offerors must provide Position Descriptions for all Offeror proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 1 and all significant subcontractors' proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 4. Is this a duplicate of the requirement in the Mission Suitability Volume under Subfactor C to provide 'written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement'? If it is a duplicate requirement, can an offeror place these in the Cost Volume and reference their location in the Mission Suitability Volume instead of duplicating the information?

RESPONSE: Yes, they are duplicative requirements. The position descriptions should be placed in the cost volume and a reference of the location in the mission suitability volume is acceptable.

24. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.15.3 Subfactor C; On DRFP Page 22 the government indicates "Offerors shall include the position title and to whom the position reports." It is highly likely that multiple individuals with a given position title will report to different individuals in the proposed organization. For example, different Senior Scientists may report to different Group Managers, Task Leads, or even to the Program Manager. Please clarify the intent of this requirement.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment and will remove the following sentence for the Final RFP from Section L.15.3 Subfactor C - "Offerors shall include the position title and to whom the position reports".

25. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.15.3 Subfactor C; M.4.1 Page 21 in the DRFP instructs that if teaming contractors or subcontractors are proposed, offerors are to provide certain information. However, in Section M on page 52, the DRFP states that "The

Government will evaluate the Offeror's use of significant subcontractors, teaming arrangements, or other associated contractual arrangements..." It does not appear that the Section L instruction is limited to 'significant' subcontractors. Are we to discuss all proposed subcontractors in this section of our proposal, or only 'significant' subcontractors?

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment and will revise Section M.4.1 Subfactor C for the Final RFP to state "all proposed subcontractors".

26. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.15.3 Subfactor D Under Subfactor D – Small Business Utilization, paragraph (a)3, the statement is made: "The numbers above reflect the Contracting Officer's assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals to be achieved at the conclusion of the award." Should not the word 'award' be replaced with the word 'contract'?

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment, however, the language will remain unchanged. The goals stated in the RFP are those goals that the CO believes can be achieved throughout the contract. The term "conclusion of the contract award" means those goals that the Government believes can be reasonably achieved for the entire contract requirement.

27. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.16.1 It is our understanding that current GSFC policy is to not evaluate price on RTOs, but rather to evaluate price based on a Government Price Model (GPM). This change in price evaluation was made on GSFC's GSMO procurement between issuance of the initial DRFP and the final RFP. In light of this understanding of GSFC's current policy, as well as the fact that the two RTOs included in the GGSG DRFP represent a small fraction of GGSG work and are highly sensitive to assumptions made about them, we strongly recommend that the GGSG final RFP reflect use of a GPM for evaluating price.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment, however, the language will remain unchanged. A procurement strategy is developed and tailored to each requirement; it is not GSFC's policy to use a Government Pricing Model (GPM) for all requirements. This GGSG procurement will evaluate technical approach and cost of the RTO's.

28. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.16.1 Is the 20% of the proposed RTO estimate, for the purposes of determining which subcontractors will be significant, against the value of the particular RTO the subcontractor has value in or against the total value of both RTOs added together?

RESPONSE: Yes, any subcontractor expected to exceed 20% of a proposed RTO estimate will be considered a significant subcontractor. This determination is based on the value of the each RTO, not against the total value of both RTO's added together.

29. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.16.2(a); L.16.2(c) The DRFP indicates that the Attachment B rates are to be used for the purposes of pricing the RTO [Section L.16.2(c)]. Since this may not be limited to only the Prime and Significant Subcontractors, we strongly recommend that the government change the requirement for Attachment B to include all subcontractors proposed, regardless of proposed contract value or percentage of RTO estimated costs.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your comment, however, no change will be made to the language. The Government expects non-Significant subcontractor costs to be proposed as Other Direct Costs, with substantiation as needed in the BOE.

30. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.16.2(e) The instructions for the Basis of Estimates (BOE) on Page 33 in the DRFP direct offerors to describe "How subcontracts were estimated. Also identify any experience you have with the proposed subcontractor(s),

if utilized.” In responding to this specific requirement, should the BOEs identify all subcontractors proposed or only those who qualify as a “significant” subcontractor for pricing purposes?

RESPONSE: The government expects that the BOE’s identify all subcontractors proposed.

31. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.16.2(f) Would the Government consider eliminating Exhibit C-4: Summary of RTO Average Hourly Cost of Doing Business, from the Final RFP? This exhibit does not accurately provide information that is relevant since the total cost of the RTO is provided and offerors pricing the RTO effort at lower experience levels would show a greater number of hours for an equivalent price, artificially lowering the “hourly cost” shown on Exhibit C-4.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request and will remove Exhibit C-4 Summary of RTO Average Hourly Cost of Doing Business from the Final RFP.

32. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.17(b) This DRFP paragraph requires the offeror to instruct each of its references to return the Past Performance Questionnaire “directly to the Government in a sealed envelope”. Will it be acceptable for the government to receive these questionnaires via facsimile or email? We find that many of our references prefer to email responses to these questionnaires and often do so despite our request that they use the addressed envelopes that we give them.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request, and will allow for Past Performance Questionnaires to be faxed to the Contracting Officer at 301-286-5373 or emailed at Jennifer.A.Oconnell@nasa.gov.

33. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.17(b) This DRFP paragraph requires that the offeror include in their proposal the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractors' past performance evaluation with the offeror. Since these letters are separate documents,

can they also be treated like the Prior Customer Evaluations and Small Business Subcontracting Plan Reports and be excluded from the 40-page limit for the Past Performance Volume?

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request, and will revise Section L.13(b)1 Table in the final RFP to exclude the Written consent of proposed significant subcontractors for the Past Performance Volume 40-page limit.

34. **QUESTION:** Reference: L.19 This DRFP paragraph requires that the offeror provide a list of acronyms used in its proposal. It further requires that the list be comprehensive and be provided as Appendix A in three volumes: Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. Generally, we provide an acronym list in each of our proposal volumes that is specific to each volume, rather than a consolidated list of all acronyms used throughout all proposal volumes. Please clarify if you are requiring a single, consolidated acronym list, or an independent list for each of the specified three volumes.

RESPONSE: A single consolidated acronym list as Appendix A should be provided in Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance Volumes.

35. **QUESTION:** Reference: M.3.2 This DRFP paragraph states that “Only the Mission Suitability factor is numerically scored.” However, unlike previous GSFC RFPs, the DRFP contains no table of Weights for Mission Suitability Subfactors or other indication of the relative weight of the four subfactors in the Mission Suitability evaluation factor. Please clarify the relative weights of the four subfactors in Mission Suitability.

RESPONSE: Mission Suitability will not be “Scored”. The sentence referenced in the Question in M.3.2 will be deleted. As stated in M.4.2 - The Government will evaluate proposals by classifying findings as strengths, weaknesses, significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the table and then after classifying findings, the Offeror’s proposal will receive one of the following

adjectival ratings: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor. The Mission Suitability evaluation will include the results of any cost realism analysis. The results of the cost realism analysis performed by the Government will be documented in the findings under the Mission Suitability factor if appropriate.

The relative importance of the four subfactors in Mission Suitability are as follows: Subfactor C—Management Approach, Subfactor B—Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTO), Subfactor A—Understanding the Key Requirements of the Statement of Work , and Subfactor D—Small Business Utilization

36. **QUESTION:** Reference: M.5 For the reasons stated above related to the Hourly Cost of Doing Business, Exhibit C-4, would the Government consider removing this from the data presented to the Source Selection Authority? This Exhibit is potentially misleading when comparing one offeror's exhibit to another, especially if the costs are similar but the hourly cost of doing business is artificially manipulated to be low by pricing labor effort using a greater number of hours at a lower labor rate in order to bring the hourly cost down, when using fewer hours at a higher labor rate may actually provide greater value to the Government due to the experience being utilized for the proposed RTO solution.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request and will remove Exhibit C-4 Summary of RTO Average Hourly Cost of Doing Business from the Final RFP and therefore, will not be presented to the Source Selection Authority.

37. **QUESTION:** Reference: M.6 In describing how the government will evaluate Past Performance, the second DRFP paragraph in M.6 states that "Evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement which creates legal responsibilities on the part of the significant subcontractors may be given more weight in the evaluation of significant subcontractors, in comparison to proposals that lack such agreements and/or evidence." It appears that the DRFP does not instruct offerors to provide this evidence in the form of copies of actual teaming agreements. We suggest that the government require the submission of binding teaming agreements in the

Offeror's Cost Volume and be exempted from any page limits specified for the volume.

RESPONSE: The government has reviewed and considered your request and will revise Section L. 17 (b) in the Final RFP to state "The offeror shall provide a copy of any binding teaming agreements or other contractual agreements (which creates legal responsibilities on the part of the significant subcontractor) in the Past Performance Volume (excluded from the Page Limitation).

38. **QUESTION:** Reference: Equipment Purchases On the current contract, the contractor supplies all desktop equipment for both on-site and off-site personnel. Is it the government's intention to continue with this practice? If so, where in the Cost Volume should this cost be presented?

RESPONSE: RESERVE TO RESPOND TO QUESTION #38 SOON.

39. **QUESTION:** Reference: General When does the government anticipate release of the final RFP?

RESPONSE: The government anticipates the release of the final RFP to be on or about October 12, 2010.

40. **QUESTION:** Reference: General How long does the government plan to allow offerors to respond to the final RFP once released?

RESPONSE: The government anticipates a 45 day response time upon Final RFP release.